

REMARKS

Claims 1–8, 10, and 11 are pending. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 9, 12, and 13–23 were previously canceled. Claims 13–23 were previously withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Claim 1 is independent.

1. Support for Claim Amendments

1.1. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the original specification at least on page 3, lines 14–18; page 13, lines 14–16; page 19, lines 9–10. Therefore, the amendments do not constitute new matter.

2. Claim Objections—Claim 1

2.1. The Examiner has objected to claim 1 for the noted informalities. In particular, the Examiner alleges that claim 1's phrase "of various of the components" constitutes improper sentence structure and requires the text to be changed to "of various components" Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

2.1.1. Claim 1 recites "components of the source computer". Claim 1 also encompasses a user selecting "various" of the recited "components". Hence the specific language recited in claim 1, "various of the components", has proper antecedent basis to the recited "components of the source computer" as opposed to "various components" which does not have the intended antecedent basis. Further, Applicants submit that "various of the components" is specific and clear to those of average skill in the art, and

Amendment Responsive to 11–12–2010 Final Office Action
Application Number: 10/731,571
Attorney Docket Number: 317071.01

is clear and precise in terms of sentence structure. Further, Applicants submit that making the change required by the Examiner would be incorrect by not having the intended antecedent basis. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

2.1.2. Further, the Examiner makes the same requirement for **claim1**'s phrase "a selection of various of the presented options". Applicants respectfully traverse for essentially the same reasons detailed in section 2.1.1 above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

3. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112—Claim 1

3.1. The Examiner has rejected **claim 1** under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. **Claim 1** is amended to address the issue noted by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

4. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103—Claims 1–6, 8, 10, and 11

4.1. The Examiner has rejected **claims 1–6, 8, 10, and 11** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrisville–Wolff (US 2003/0041130) ("Wolff") in view of Selitrennikoff (US 6,301,612). Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

4.2. Regarding independent **claim 1**, the claim encompasses *an inventory of a computer that identifies user state of the computer, the user state including user settings pertaining to hardware, software, and peripherals of the computer*. Wolff, on the other hand, teaches collecting “client system data” that includes “number and type of systems and computing components, installed OS, networking configurations, installed patches, applications installed, and the like” (para [0046]), but is silent regarding *user settings* of any kind, and *user settings pertaining to hardware, software and peripherals, of a computer* in particular, as encompassed by **claim 1**. Further, Selitrennikoff fails to mention *user state* or *user settings* at all, and mentions peripheral devices only in the context of being “non-critical hardware” (col. 10, lines 42–44). Thus, Selitrennikoff is also silent regarding *user settings pertaining to hardware, software and peripherals, of a computer* in particular, as encompassed by **claim 1**. Accordingly, Wolff and Selitrennikoff, considered separately and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “wherein the inventory further identifies user state of the source computer, and wherein the user state includes user settings that pertain to software and hardware installed on the source computer and to peripheral devices capable of being coupled to the source computer”, as recited in **claim 1**. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

4.3. Further regarding **claim 1**, the claim encompasses *a computer producing its own inventory*. Wolff, on the other hand, teaches that *a service provider gathers the client system data* (para [0043]). The service performs the gathering using “sessioning of data exchanges to collect client system data 316” (para [0046]). Wolff provides no further details about *how* the service gathers the client data other than via “data exchanges”, but Wolff makes it clear that *it is the service that gathers the client data while providing no suggestion that the client itself produces the data*, as encompassed by **claim 1**.

Further, Selitrennikoff teaches a server sending a registry and configuration file to a client (the opposite of the recited features), but also fails to suggest *a computer producing its own inventory*, as encompassed by **claim 1**. Accordingly, Wolff and Selitrennikoff, considered separately and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “surveying, by a source computer, components of the source computer, wherein the surveying results in an inventory of the components, wherein the inventory identifies hardware and software installed on the source computer, and wherein the inventory further identifies user state of the source computer”, as recited in **claim 1**. Therefore,

4.4. Regarding **claims 2–7, 8, 10, and 11**, these claims depend from allowable **claim 1** and are therefore likewise allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above Amendments and Remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over any cited art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this Amendment, that the Application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Responsive to 11-12-2010 Final Office Action
Application Number: 10/731,571
Attorney Docket Number: 317071.01

AMENDMENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: 2-1-2011

By: /L. Alan Collins/

L. Alan Collins
Reg. No.: 57,646

Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399
Telephone: (425) 707-9382

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

2-1-2011
Date

/Julie A. Collins/
Julie A. Collins

Amendment Responsive to 11-12-2010 Final Office Action
Application Number: 10/731,571
Attorney Docket Number: 317071.01